

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Cara Palladino, Isabelle Barker  
plaintiffs,

Civil Action

v.

No. 2:13-cv-05641-MAM

Thomas W. Corbett, in his official  
capacity as Governor of Pennsylvania, and his  
successors in office;

Kathleen Kane, in her official capacity as Attorney  
General of Pennsylvania, and her successors in office,  
defendants

**MOTION FOR MORE DEFINITIVE STATEMENT OF,  
OR TO STRIKE, RESPONSE TO APPLICATION TO INTERVENE AND LETTER  
WITH OPINION ATTACHED**

Applicants for intervention James D. Schneller, and Philadelphia Metro Task Force, apply for an order directing plaintiffs to file a more definite statement of their response to application to intervene, and striking plaintiffs' letter to the Court dated , stating as follows:

1. Plaintiffs filed a response to THE application for leave to intervene ("response") on January 24, 2014.
2. Applicants request a more definite statement of the plaintiff's response because the response has no numbered paragraphs and is in all ways a memorandum of law. United States use of Truscon Steel Co. v George Dreyman, Inc. (1945, DC Pa) 4 FRD 361.
3. Applicants request a more definite statement of the plaintiff's response because their application alleges numerous statements of fact or mixed fact and law, and plaintiff's response provides little means for applicants to know which defenses and denials of fact against which they must prepare.

4. Appellants request that the letter with copy of the opinion and order denying intervention to applicants in Middle District No. 13-1861, Whitewood et al v. Wolf et al, that has been submitted to the Court, be stricken or directed to be filed as a pleading.

5. Applicants object also due to complete absence of particularization as to why said letter is pertinent by the filing party. Applicants have not been informed of what issues present in the opinion, which they might be required to defend.


6. The letter has not been filed of record.

7. The letter is unintelligible as a pleading. Even if the letter and opinion are intended as a general statement of res judicata or issue preclusion, there is no pleading discussing the claims and issues purported to be precluded nor why the opinion can stand as law of the case.

8. The response is unintelligible as an answer. This causes the letter to also be further unintelligible and vague.

WHEREFORE, movants respectfully request the Court's order directing plaintiffs to file an amended response to motion to intervene, which states more definitely their answer.

WHEREFORE, movants respectfully request the Court's order striking the letter with opinion attached, served on the Court, or instructions to file the letter as or with a pleading.

  
James D. Schneller pro se  
Philadelphia Metro Task Force  
430 East Lancaster Avenue #E 25  
Radnor, PA 19087 610-688-9471

Date: February 17, 2014

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Cara Palladino, Isabelle Barker  
plaintiffs,

v.

Thomas W. Corbett, in his official  
capacity as Governor of Pennsylvania, et al  
defendants

Civil Action

No. 2:13-cv-05641-MAM

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**


I, James Schneller, hereby certify that I served a true and correct copy of the motion for more definite statement and to strike letter, upon the parties, by USPS 1<sup>st</sup> Class mail, and email as follows:

William H. Lamb Esquire  
Lamb McErlane P.C.  
P.O. Box 565  
West Chester, PA 19381-0565

Mary Abbegaël Giunta Esquire  
Pennsylvania Office of the Attorney General  
Strawberry Square 15th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Benjamin L. Jerner Esquire  
Jerner & Palmer PC  
5401 Wissahickon Avenue  
Philadelphia, Pa 19144

Eric Kraeutler Esquire  
Morgan Lewis Bockius LLP  
1701 Market St  
Philadelphia, Pa 19103-2921

  
James D. Schneller pro se

Date: February 18, 2013